



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

January 24, 2005

Mr. Paul C. Sarahan
Director, Litigation Division
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P. O. Box 13087
Austin, TX 78711-3087

OR2005-00668

Dear Mr. Sarahan:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 217303.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (the "commission") received a request for documents related to a person who did work in the Leaking Petroleum Storage Tank ("LPST") program and was later involved in an administrative trial. You state that you have made some of the documents available to the requestor, but you claim that the remaining requested information is excepted from disclosure under sections 552.101, 552.107, 552.111, and 552.116 of the Government Code. We have considered the exceptions you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.¹

First, you argue that the social security numbers submitted in Exhibit C-1 are excepted under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.001 of the Occupations Code.² Section 58.001 provides as follows:

¹We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). This open records letter does not reach, and therefore does not authorize the withholding of, any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

²There are currently two different sections of the Occupations Code denominated as section 58.001. The section relating to "[t]he social security number of an applicant for or holder of a license, certificate of registration, or other legal authorization issued by a licensing agency to practice in a specific occupation or profession" was renumbered from section 56.001 to section 58.001 in 2003. *See* Act of May 20, 2003, 78th Leg., R.S., ch. 1275, § 2(112), 2003 Tex. Gen. Laws 4140, 4146.

The social security number of an applicant for or holder of a license, certificate of registration, or other legal authorization issued by a licensing agency to practice in a specific occupation or profession that is provided to the licensing agency is confidential and not subject to disclosure under Chapter 552, Government Code.

Occ. Code § 58.001. The submitted certification report and application contain the social security number of a license holder. We conclude that the social security numbers contained in Exhibit C-1, which we have marked, are excepted from disclosure under section 552.101 of the Government Code in conjunction with section 58.001 of the Occupations Code.

You next claim that Exhibit C-2 is excepted from disclosure by section 552.107 of the Government Code. Section 552.107(1) of the Government Code protects information coming within the attorney-client privilege. When asserting the attorney-client privilege, a governmental body has the burden of providing the necessary facts to demonstrate the elements of the privilege in order to withhold the information at issue. Open Records Decision No. 676 at 6-7 (2002). First, a governmental body must demonstrate that the information constitutes or documents a communication. *Id.* at 7. Second, the communication must have been made "for the purpose of facilitating the rendition of professional legal services" to the client governmental body. Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1). The privilege does not apply when an attorney or representative is involved in some capacity other than that of providing or facilitating professional legal services to the client governmental body. *In re Texas Farmers Ins. Exch.*, 990 S.W.2d 337, 340 (Tex. App.—Texarkana 1999, orig. proceeding)(attorney-client privilege does not apply if attorney acting in a capacity other than that of attorney). Governmental attorneys often act in capacities other than that of professional legal counsel, such as administrators, investigators, or managers. Thus, the mere fact that a communication involves an attorney for the government does not demonstrate this element. Third, the privilege applies only to communications between or among clients, client representatives, lawyers, and lawyer representatives. Tex. R. Evid. 503(b)(1)(A), (B), (C), (D), (E). Thus, a governmental body must inform this office of the identities and capacities of the individuals to whom each communication at issue has been made. Lastly, the attorney-client privilege applies only to a confidential communication, *id.* 503(b)(1), meaning it was "not intended to be disclosed to third persons other than those to whom disclosure is made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services to the client or those reasonably necessary for the transmission of the communication." *Id.* 503(a)(5). Whether a communication meets this definition depends on the intent of the parties involved at the time the information was communicated. *Osborne v. Johnson*, 954 S.W.2d 180, 184 (Tex. App.—Waco 1997, no writ). Moreover, because the client may elect to waive the privilege at any time, a governmental body must explain that the confidentiality of a communication has been maintained. Section 552.107(1) generally excepts an entire communication that is demonstrated to be protected by the attorney-client privilege unless otherwise waived by the governmental body. *See Huie v. DeShazo*, 922 S.W.2d 920, 923 (Tex. 1996)(privilege extends to entire communication, including facts contained therein).

You state that the submitted documents in Exhibit C-2 are communications or document communications between commission attorneys and commission staff made in furtherance of the rendition of professional legal services. You further explain that the submitted documents in Exhibit C-2 were intended to be confidential and have remained confidential. Having considered your arguments and the submitted information, we agree that most of this information constitutes privileged attorney-client communications that may be withheld under section 552.107(1). However, some of the documents you seek to withhold include handwritten notes. We have marked the handwritten notes that may be withheld as you indicate that they were written by the client to the attorney. The remaining notes themselves do not indicate, and you have not otherwise explained, how they reflect privileged communications. Therefore, we find that you have not met your burden of establishing that these notes constitute privileged attorney-client communications, and the commission may not withhold the remaining handwritten notes on the basis of section 552.107. Thus, the commission may withhold the information we have marked under section 552.107 of the Government Code.

We next address your argument under section 552.111 of the Government Code for the documents submitted in Exhibit C-3. Section 552.111 excepts from disclosure “an interagency or intraagency memorandum or letter that would not be available by law to a party in litigation with the agency.” In Open Records Decision No. 615 (1993), this office reexamined the predecessor to the section 552.111 exception in light of the decision in *Texas Department of Public Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ), and held that section 552.111 excepts only those internal communications consisting of advice, recommendations, opinions, and other material reflecting the policymaking processes of the governmental body. *City of Garland v. Dallas Morning News*, 22 S.W.3d 351, 364 (Tex. 2000); *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist. v. Texas Attorney Gen.*, 37 S.W.3d 152 (Tex. App.—Austin 2001, no pet.). An agency’s policymaking functions do not encompass internal administrative or personnel matters; disclosure of information relating to such matters will not inhibit free discussion among agency personnel as to policy issues. ORD 615 at 5-6. Additionally, section 552.111 does not generally except from disclosure purely factual information that is severable from the opinion portions of internal memoranda. *Arlington Indep. Sch. Dist.*, 37 S.W.3d at 160; ORD 615 at 4-5. After reviewing your arguments and the submitted documents in Exhibit C-3, we have marked the information that may be withheld under section 552.111 of the Government Code.

We finally consider your argument under section 552.116 of the Government Code for the information submitted in Exhibit C-4. This section provides in pertinent part:

(a) An audit working paper of an audit of the state auditor or the auditor of a state agency, an institution of higher education as defined by Section 61.003, Education Code, a county, or a municipality is excepted from [public disclosure]. If information in an audit working paper is also maintained in another record, that other record is not excepted from [public disclosure] by this section.

(b) In this section:

(1) 'Audit' means an audit authorized or required by a statute of this state or the United States and includes an investigation.

(2) 'Audit working paper' includes all information, documentary or otherwise, prepared or maintained in conducting an audit or preparing an audit report, including:

(A) intra-agency and interagency communications; and

(B) drafts of the audit report or portions of those drafts.

Gov't Code § 552.116. You indicate that the information submitted as Exhibit C-4 was produced as a result of an investigation and audit of a company billing the LPST Fund. You further inform us that this investigation and audit was conducted in accordance with section 321.026 of the Government Code. After reviewing your arguments and the submitted information, we find that the information submitted in Exhibit C-4 constitutes audit working papers for the purposes of section 552.116 of the Government Code. Consequently, the commission may withhold the information submitted in Exhibit C-4 under section 552.116.

In summary, the marked social security numbers in Exhibit C-1 must be withheld under section 552.101 in conjunction with section 58.001 of the Occupations Code. The information marked in Exhibit C-2 may be withheld under section 552.107. The marked information in Exhibit C-3 may be withheld under section 552.111. The information in Exhibit C-4 may be withheld under section 552.116. The remaining information must be released.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov't Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records

will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Elizabeth A. Stephens", written in a cursive style.

Elizabeth A. Stephens
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

EAS/krl

Ref: ID#217303

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Mr. George Berre
3611 Sheridan
Wichita Falls, TX 76302
(w/o enclosures)